



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/784,309	02/20/2004	James Turkson	USF-T194XC1	2143	
23557	7590 07/28/2005		EXAMINER		
	CHIK LLOYD & SAL	HEARD, THOMAS SWEENEY			
PO BOX 1429	ONAL ASSOCIATION 950		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			1654		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Occurs		10/784,309		TURKSON ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit		
		Thomas S. I		1654		
Period fo	 The MAILING DATE of this communic r Reply 	cation appears on the d	over sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION SIONS of time may be available under the provisions of SiX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply was ply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event unication. of days, a reply within the statuto utory period will apply and will a will, by statute, cause the applica	, however, may a reply be tim ry minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on				
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2	b)⊡ This action is nor	n-final.			
-	Since this application is in condition f	· · · · ·	-			
	closed in accordance with the practic	e under <i>Ex parte Qua</i> y	/le, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the apta of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.	e withdrawn from cons				
	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> are subject to restriction	n and/or election requ	rement.			
Application	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the			•		
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:					
•	Applicant may not request that any object			, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including t The oath or declaration is objected to	·		, ,		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	(s)					
2) Notice 3) Inform Paper	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P No(s)/Mail Date	TO-948) PTO/SB/08) 5	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P Other:		<u> </u>	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-9, 15 and 16 are drawn to a peptidomimetic, classified in class
 514. subclass 2.
- II. Claims 10-14 are drawn to method of treatment, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case SSI-1 (for STAT-induced STAT inhibitor-1) and be used to inhibit STAT activity and do not require the peptidomimetic of the instant application.

The several inventions above are independent and distinct, each from the other. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Further, a reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group. Finally, the consideration for patentability is different in each case. Thus, it would be an undue

burden to examine all of the above inventions in one application. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each Group is not necessarily required for the other Groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: peptidomimetic inhibitors

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 1-8 and 11-16 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

Art Unit: 1654

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See

Art Unit: 1654

"Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas S. Heard whose telephone number is (571) 272-2064. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/784,309

Art Unit: 1654

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TSH

BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Page 6